arXiv:1512.04246v1 [math.NA] 14 Dec 2015

Numerical stability of iterative refinement with a relaxation for linear systems

Alicja Smoktunowicz, Jakub Kierzkowski and Iwona Wróbel *

December 15, 2015

Abstract

Stability analysis of Wilkinson's iterative refinement with a relaxation IR(ω) for solving linear systems is given. It extends existing results for $\omega = 1$, i.e., for Wilkinson's iterative refinement. We assume that all computations are performed in fixed (working) precision arithmetic. Numerical tests were done in *MATLAB* to illustrate our theoretical results. A particular emphasis is given on convergence of iterative refinement with a relaxation. Our tests confirm that the choice $\omega = 1$ is the best choice from the point of numerical stability.

Keywords: Iterative refinement, numerical stability, condition number

AMS2010 MSC: 65F05, 65F10, 15A12

1 Introduction

We consider the system $Ax = b$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is nonsingular and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Iterative refinement techniques for linear systems of equations are very useful in practice and the literature on this subject is very rich (see [1]–[5], [8]– [18]).

The idea of relaxing the iterative refinement step is the following. We require a basic linear equation solver S for $Ax = b$ which uses a factorization of A into simple factors (e.g., triangular, block-triangular etc.). Such factorization is used again in the next steps of iterative refinement. Wilkinson's iterative refinement with a relaxation IR(ω) consists of three steps.

*Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science, Warsaw University of Technology, Koszykowa 75, 00-662 Warsaw, Poland, e-mails: smok@mini.pw.edu.pl, J.Kierzkowski@mini.pw.edu.pl, wrubelki@wp.pl

Algorithm IR(ω)

Given $\omega > 0$. Let x_0 be computed by the solver S.
For $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, the kth iteration consists of the three steps:

1. Compute $r_k = b - Ax_k$.
2. Solve $Ap_k = r_k$ for p_k by the basic solution solver S.
3. Add the correction, $x_{k+1} = x_k + \omega\, p_k$.

Clearly, $\omega = 1$ corresponds to Wilkinson's iterative refinement (see [16]). Wu and Wang (see [17]) proposed this method for $\omega = \frac{h}{h+1}$, where $h > 0$ (i.e., for $0 < \omega < 1$). They developed the method as the numerical integration of a dynamic system with step size h. A preliminay error analysis of the Algorithm IR(ω) was given in [17] for $0 < \omega < 1$, assuming that the extended precision is used for computing the residual vectors r_k. Wu and Wang considered only Gaussian elimination as a solver S .

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the convergence of this method for $0 < \omega < 2$ and to show with examples that the choice $\omega = 1$ is the best choice from the point of numerical stability.

Notice that for arbitrary $\omega > 0$, the IR(ω) method is a stationary method (in the theory) and we have $p_k = A^{-1}r_k = x^* - x_k$, so $x_{k+1} - x^* = (1 - \omega)(x_k - x^*)$, $\quad k = 0, 1, \ldots$, where x^* is the exact solution to $Ax = b$. We see that the sequence $\{x_k\}$ is convergent for arbitrary initial x_0 if and only if $0 < \omega < 2$. For $\omega = 1$ (Wilkinson's iterative refinement) x_1 will be the exact solution x^*. It is interesting to check the influence on the relaxation parameter ω on numerical properties of the algorithm IR(ω), assuming that all computations are performed only in the working (fixed) precision.

Throughout the paper we use only the 2-norm and assume that all computations are performed in the working (fixed) precision. We use a floating point arithmetic which satisfies the IEEE floating point standard (see Chapter 2 in [10]). For two floating point numbers a and b we have

$$fl(a \diamond b) = (a \diamond b)(1 + \Delta), \quad |\Delta| \leq \varepsilon_M$$

for results in the normalized range, where $\diamond$ denotes any of the elementary scalar operations $+, -, *, /$ and ε_M is machine precision.

In this paper we present a comparison of Wilkinson's iterative refinement with a relaxation IR(ω) from the point of view of numerical stability. More precisely, we say that the computed $\tilde{x}$ in floating point arithmetic is a **forward stable** solution to $Ax = b$ if

$$\|\tilde{x} - x^*\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_M)\kappa(A)\|x^*\|. \tag{1}$$

Throughout this paper, $\|\cdot\|$ is the matrix or vector two–norm depending upon context, and $\kappa(A) = \|A^{-1}\|\|A\|$ denotes the standard condition number of the matrix A.

A stronger property than forward stability is backward stability. It means that the computed $\tilde{x}$ in floating point arithmetic is the exact solution of a slightly perturbed system

$$(A + \Delta A)\tilde{x} = b, \quad \|\Delta A\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_M)\|A\|. \tag{2}$$

Our analysis is similar in spirit to [8]–[11] and [14]-[15]. Jankowski and Woźniakowski proved in [11] that an arbitrary solver S which satisfies (3), supported by iterative refinement, is normwise forward stable as long as A is not too ill-conditioned (say, $\varepsilon_M\kappa(A) < 1$), and is normwise backward stable under additional condition $q\kappa(A) < 1$. We extend their results for the algorithm IR(ω).

The paper is organized as follows. A proof of numerical stability of IR(ω) is given in Section 2. In Section 3, we present some numerical experiments that illustrate our theoretical results.

2 Forward stability of IR(ω)

We require a basic linear equation solver S for $Ax = b$ such that the computed solution $\tilde{x}$ by S satisfies

$$\|\tilde{x} - x^*\| \leq q \, \||x^*|\|, \quad q \leq 0.1. \tag{3}$$

We make a standard assumption that the matrix-vector multiplication is backward stable. Then the computed residual vector $\tilde{r} = fl(b - A\tilde{x})$ satisfies

$$\tilde{r} = b - A\tilde{x} + \Delta r, \quad \|\Delta r\| \leq L(n)\varepsilon_M(||b|| + ||A||||\tilde{x}||), \tag{4}$$

where $L(n)$ is a modestly growing function on n.

We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1 *Let IR(ω) for $\omega \in (0, 2)$ be applied to the nonsingular linear system $Ax = b$ using the solver S satisfying (3)-(4). Let $\tilde{x}_k$, $\tilde{r}_k$ and $\tilde{p}_k$ denote the computed vectors in floating point arithmetic. Assume that*

$$\varepsilon_M \leq 0.01, \quad L(n)\varepsilon_M \, \kappa(A) \leq 0.01 \tag{5}$$

and

$$|1 - \omega| + \omega q \leq 0.6. \tag{6}$$

Then for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ we have

$$||\tilde{x}_k - x^*|| \leq q_k||x^*||, \quad q_k \leq 0.1, \tag{7}$$

where

$$q_{k+1} = (|1 - \omega| + q\omega)q_k + 2.31\omega L(n)\varepsilon_M\kappa(A) + 1.64\varepsilon_M, \tag{8}$$

with $q_0 = q$.

Proof. Assume that (7) holds for k. We prove that it holds also for $k+1$, i.e. $||\tilde{x}_{k+1} - x^*|| \leq q_{k+1}\,||x^*||$, where $q_{k+1} \leq 0.1$ and q_{k+1} satisfies (8).

Under assumption (4), the computed vectors $\tilde{r}_k$ satisfy

$$\tilde{r}_k = b - A\tilde{x}_k + \Delta r_k, \quad ||\Delta r_k|| \leq \varepsilon_M L(n)(||b|| + ||A||||\tilde{x}_k||). \tag{9}$$

Under assumption (3) we have

$$\tilde{p}_k = p_k^* + \Delta p_k, \quad p_k^* = A^{-1}\tilde{r}_k, \quad \|\Delta p_k\| \leq q\|p_k^*\|. \tag{10}$$

Standard error analysis shows

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} = (I + D_k^{(1)})(\tilde{x}_k + (I + D_k^{(2)})\omega\tilde{p}_k), \quad \|D_k^{(i)}\| \leq \varepsilon_M. \tag{11}$$

By inductive assertion, we have $\|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\| \leq q_k\|x^*\|$. Hence

$$\|\tilde{x}_k\| = \|x^* + (\tilde{x}_k - x^*)\| \leq \|x^*\| + \|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\| \leq (1 + q_k)\|x^*\|.$$

Similarly, from (10) it follows that $\|\tilde{p}_k\| \leq (1 + q)\|p_k^*\|$, thus

$$\|\tilde{x}_k\| \leq 1.1\|x^*\|, \quad \|\tilde{p}_k\| \leq 1.1\|p_k^*\|. \tag{12}$$

From (9) and the inequality $\|b\| = \|Ax_*\| \leq \|A\|\|x_*\|$ it can be seen that

$$\tilde{r}_k = b - A\tilde{x}_k + \Delta r_k, \quad \|\Delta r_k\| \leq 2.1L(n)\varepsilon_M\|A\|\|x^*\|. \tag{13}$$

We have

$$p_k^* = A^{-1}\tilde{r}_k = x^* - \tilde{x}_k + \xi_k, \quad \xi_k = A^{-1}\Delta r_k. \tag{14}$$

This together with (13) implies the bounds

$$\|p_k^*\| \leq \|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\| + \|\xi_k\|, \quad \|\xi_k\| \leq 2.1L(n)\varepsilon_M\kappa(A)\|x^*\|. \tag{15}$$

Now our task is to bound the error $\|\tilde{x}_{k+1} - x^*\|$. For simplicity, we define $D_k^{(3)}$ such that

$$I + D_k^{(3)} = (I + D_k^{(1)})(I + D_k^{(2)}).$$

Clearly, $\|D_k^{(3)}\| \leq 2\varepsilon_M + \varepsilon_M^2$, so from (11) we get

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} = (\tilde{x}_k + \omega\tilde{p}_k) + \eta_k, \quad \|\eta_k\| \leq \varepsilon_M\|\tilde{x}_k\| + (2\varepsilon_M + \varepsilon_M^2)\omega\|\tilde{p}_k\|. \tag{16}$$

This together with (10) and (14) gives the identity

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} - x^* = (1-\omega)(\tilde{x}_k - x^*) + \eta_k + \omega(\xi_k + \Delta p_k).$$

Taking norms and using (10), we obtain

$$\|\tilde{x}_{k+1} - x^*\| \leq |1-\omega|\|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\| + \|\eta_k\| + \omega\|\xi_k\| + \omega q\|p_k^*\|. \tag{17}$$

First we estimate $\|\eta_k\|$. Since $\|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\| \leq 0.1\|x^*\|$, so by assumption (5) we obtain from (15) the bounds

$$\|\xi_k\| \leq 0.021\|x^*\|, \quad \|p_k^*\| \leq 0.121\|x^*\|. \tag{18}$$

From (12) and (16) we have $\|\eta_k\| \leq 1.1\varepsilon_M(\|x^*\| + (2+\varepsilon_M)\omega\|p_k^*\|)$. Now we apply (5) and (18). Since $\omega < 2$, we see that $\|\eta_k\| \leq 1.64\,\varepsilon_M\|x^*\|$. Therefore,

$$\omega\|\xi_k\| + \|\eta_k\| \leq \omega 2.1 L(n)\varepsilon_M\kappa(A)\|x^*\| + 1.64\,\varepsilon_M\|x^*\|$$

and by (15) we get

$$\omega q\|p_k^*\| \leq \omega q\|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\| + \omega q 2.1 L(n)\varepsilon_M\kappa(A)\|x^*\|.$$

Hence, from (17) and by (5)-(6) we finally obtain

$$\|\tilde{x}_{k+1} - x^*\| \leq (|1-\omega| + \omega q)\|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\| + 2.31\omega L(n)\varepsilon_M\kappa(A) + 1.64\varepsilon_M\|x^*\|.$$

We conclude that $\|\tilde{x}_{k+1} - x^*\| \leq q_{k+1}\|x^*\|$, with q_{k+1} defined in (8). It remains to prove that $q_{k+1} \leq 0.1$. By assumptions (5) and (6) and using the fact that $q_k \leq 0.1$, we see that $q_{k+1} \leq 0.6 * 0.1 + (0.0231 + 0.0164)$, so $q_{k+1} \leq 0.1$. This completes the proof. □

Theorem 2.1 *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 the algorithm IR(ω) is forward stable for $\omega \in (0,2)$. There exists k^* depending only on n such that for every $k \geq k^*$ the following inequality holds*

$$\|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\| \leq (11.6L(n) + 4.2)\varepsilon_M\ \kappa(A)\|x^*\|. \tag{19}$$

Proof. We apply the results of Lemma 2.1. Notice that from (7)-(8) and by assumptions (5) it follows that

$$q_{k+1} \leq q_k 0.6 + 2.31\omega L(n)\varepsilon_M \kappa(A) + 1.64\varepsilon_M.$$

Since $\omega < 2$ and $1 \leq \kappa(A)$, we get

$$q_{k+1} \leq q_k 0.6 + (4.62L(n) + 1.64)\varepsilon_M \kappa(A).$$

From this it follows that

$$q_{k+1} \leq (0.6)^k + \frac{4.62L(n) + 1.64}{1 - 0.6}\varepsilon_M \kappa(A).$$

From this (19) follows immediately. □

3 Numerical tests

In this section we present numerical experiments that show the comparison of the IR(ω) for different values of ω. All tests were performed in *MATLAB* version 8.*4.0.150421 (R2014b)*, with $\varepsilon_M \approx 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$.

Let $x^* = A^{-1}b$ be the exact solution to $Ax = b$ and let $\tilde{x}_k$ be the computed approximation to x^* by IR(ω). We produced the $n \times n$ matrix A and the vector $b = Ax^*$, with $x^* = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T$.

We report the following statistics for each iteration:

- forward stability error

$$\alpha(A, b, \tilde{x}_k) = \frac{\|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\|}{\kappa(A)\,\|x^*\|}, \tag{20}$$

- backward stability error

$$\beta(A, b, \tilde{x}_k) = \frac{\|b - A\tilde{x}_k\|}{\|A\|\,\|\tilde{x}_k\|}, \tag{21}$$

- componentwise backward stability error

$$\gamma(A, b, \tilde{x}_k) = \max_i \frac{(|b - A\tilde{x}_k|)_i}{(|A|\,|\tilde{x}_k|)_i}. \tag{22}$$

Note that, the componentwise stability implies the backward stability, and backward stability implies forward stability.

We consider the following solvers S.

Algorithm I (GEPP). Gaussian elimination with partial pivoting (GEPP) for the system $Ax = b$.

Algorithm II (BLU). This method uses a block LU factorization $A = LU$ ([6]):

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ L_{21} & I \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} U_{11} & U_{12} \\ 0 & U_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{23}$$

We assume that $A_{11}(m \times m)$ is nonsingular. Then

1. $U_{11} = A_{11}$, $U_{12} = A_{12}$.
2. Solve the system $L_{21}A_{11} = A_{21}$ for L_{21} (by GEPP).
3. Compute the Schur complement $U_{22} = A_{22} - L_{21}A_{12}$.

Next we solve the system $LUx = b$ by solving two linear systems, using the *MATLAB* commands

```
y=L\b;   x=U\y;
```

Example 1 *Take $A = W_n$, where W_n is the famous Wilkinson's matrix of order n:*

$$W_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & \dots & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{24}$$

We cite R.D. Skeel who wrote in [14]: "Gaussian elimination with pivoting is not always as accurate as one might reasonably expect". It is known (see [16]) that GEPP is considered numerically stable unless the growth factor ρ_n is large. For Wilkinson's matrix W_n we have $\rho_n = 2^{n-1}$. Description of other types of matrices for which the growth factor is very large is given in [7] and [10], Section 9. It is interesting that for $n = 100$ the Wilkinson matrix is perfectly well-conditioned, but GEPP produces an unstable solution! After one step of Wilkinson's iterative refinement (for $\omega = 1$) we get the exact solution $x^* = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$. The situation is different for other choices of parameter ω. The results are contained in Table 1.

Example 2 *We test Algorithm I (GEPP) on badly scaled tridiagonally matrix A generated by the MATLAB code*

Table 1: Values of the forward stability error (20) for Algorithm I (GEPP) , where A is the 100×100 Wilkinson matrix defined in (24). Here $\kappa(A) = 44.8$.

ω/k	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.2
0	1.51E-02	1.51E-02	1.51E-02	1.51E-02	1.51E-02	1.51E-02
1	1.05E-02	7.56E-03	4.54E-03	1.51E-03	0	3.02E-03
2	7.41E-03	3.78E-03	1.36E-03	1.51E-04	0	6.05E-04
3	5.19E-03	1.89E-03	4.08E-04	1.51E-05	0	1.21E-04
4	3.63E-03	9.46E-04	1.22E-04	1.51E-06	0	2.42E-05
5	2.54E-03	4.73E-04	3.67E-05	1.51E-07	0	4.84E-06
6	1.78E-03	2.36E-04	1.10E-05	1.51E-08	0	9.68E-07
7	1.24E-03	1.18E-04	3.31E-06	1.51E-09	0	1.93E-07
8	8.72E-04	5.91E-05	9.93E-07	1.51E-10	0	3.87E-08
9	6.10E-04	2.95E-05	2.97E-07	1.51E-11	0	7.75E-09
10	4.27E-04	1.47E-05	8.93E-08	1.51E-12	0	1.55E-09

```
randn('state',0)
n=10;m=5;
u=randn(n,1); v=randn(n-1,1);
A=diag(u)+diag(v,-1)+diag(v,1);
t=1e10;  A(m-1,m)=t;
end
```

Random matrices of entries from the distribution $N(0,1)$. They were generated by the MATLAB function "randn". Before each usage the random number generator was reset to its initial state. Notice that only the element $A_{4,5}$ is very large (equals 10^{10}), hence the matrix A is ill-conditioned. The values of the componentwise stability error (22) are gathered in Table 2. Clearly the best results are obtained for $\omega = 1$ (Wilkinson's original iterative refinement). We don't display the forward error (20) and backward stability error (21) because they were always small (of order ε_M).

Example 3 *We generate a block matrix A as in (23) using the following MATLAB code.*

```
m=8; n=2*m;
rand('state',0);
A=rand(n);
A(1:m,1:m)=hilb(m);
```

Table 2: Values of the componentwise stability error (22) for Algorithm I (GEPP) , where A is the 10×10 tridiagonal matrix defined in Example 2 for $t = 10^{10}$. Here $\kappa(A) = 7.74 \cdot 10^{10}$.

ω/k	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.2
0	1.02E-06	1.024E-06	1.02E-06	1.02E-06	1.02E-06	1.02E-06
1	7.15E-07	5.10E-07	3.06E-07	1.02E-07	1.15E-16	2.04E-07
2	5.00E-07	2.55E-07	9.19E-08	1.02E-08	1.15E-16	4.08E-08
3	3.50E-07	1.27E-07	2.75E-08	1.02E-09	1.15E-16	8.17E-09
4	2.45E-07	6.38E-08	8.27E-09	1.02E-10	1.15E-16	1.63E-09
5	1.71E-07	3.19E-08	2.48E-09	1.02E-11	1.15E-16	3.27E-10
6	1.20E-07	1.59E-08	7.44E-10	1.021E-12	1.15E-16	6.54E-11
7	8.41E-08	7.98E-09	2.23E-10	1.021E-13	1.15E-16	1.30E-11
8	5.89E-08	3.99E-09	6.70E-11	1.01E-14	1.15E-16	2.61E-12
9	4.12E-08	1.99E-09	2.01E-11	1.07E-15	1.15E-16	5.23E-13
10	2.88E-08	9.97E-10	6.034E-12	1.54E-16	1.15E-16	1.04E-13

The matrix A is very well-conditioned, with the condition number $\kappa(A) = 2.08 \cdot 10^2$ but the block $(1,1)$ of A is ill-conditioned: $\kappa(A_{11}) = 4.75 \cdot 10^8$. Here $H = hilb(m)$ is a $m \times m$ Hilbert matrix defined by

$$H = (h_{ij}), \;\; h_{ij} = \frac{1}{i+j-1}, \;\; i,j = 1, \ldots, m.$$

The results are contained in Tables 3-5.

Based on the numerical results of this section, we conclude that one step of Wilkinson's iterative refinement ($\omega = 1$) is usually be enough to yield small errors (20)–(22). However, iterative refinement with a relaxation ω which is not close to 1, can require much more steps than Wilkinson's iterative refinement. Therefore, the choice $\omega = 1$ is the best choice from the point of numerical stability.

References

[1] M. Arioli, J. Demmel, I.S. Duff, Solving sparse linear systems with sparse backward error, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 10 (1989), 165–190.

[2] M. Arioli, J.Scott, Chebyshev acceleration of iterative refinement, Numer. Algor. 66 (2014), 591-608.

Table 3: Values of the forward stability error (20) for Algorithm II (BLU), where A is the 16×16 matrix defined in Example 3.

ω/k	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.2
0	2.01E-10	2.01E-10	2.01E-10	2.01E-10	2.01E-10	2.01E-10
1	1.41E-10	1.00E-10	6.05E-11	2.01E-11	3.57E-17	4.03E-11
2	9.89E-11	5.04E-11	1.81E-11	2.01E-12	2.64E-17	8.07E-12
3	6.92E-11	2.52E-11	5.45E-12	2.01E-13	9.57E-18	1.61E-12
4	4.84E-11	1.26E-11	1.63E-12	2.01E-14	8.91E-18	3.23E-13
5	3.39E-11	6.31E-12	4.90E-13	2.01E-15	1.19E-17	6.46E-14
6	2.37E-11	3.15E-12	1.47E-13	1.96E-16	2.94E-17	1.29E-14
7	1.66E-11	1.57E-12	4.41E-14	2.62E-17	1.46E-17	2.58E-15
8	1.16E-11	7.88E-13	1.32E-14	3.71E-17	2.04E-17	5.12E-16
9	8.14E-12	3.94E-13	3.96E-15	5.36E-17	2.47E-17	9.83E-17
10	5.70E-12	1.97E-13	1.19E-15	2.70E-17	3.22E-17	4.84E-17

Table 4: Values of the backward stability error (21) for Algorithm II (BLU), where A is the 16×16 matrix defined in Example 3.

ω/k	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.2
0	4.03E-09	4.03E-09	4.03E-09	4.03E-09	4.03E-09	4.03E-09
1	2.82E-09	2.01E-09	1.21E-09	4.03E-10	1.90E-16	8.06E-10
2	1.97E-09	1.00E-09	3.63E-10	4.03E-11	1.92E-16	1.61E-10
3	1.38E-09	5.04E-10	1.08E-10	4.03E-12	1.43E-16	3.22E-11
4	9.68E-10	2.52E-10	3.26E-11	4.03E-13	1.53E-16	6.45E-12
5	6.78E-10	1.26E-10	9.80E-12	4.03E-14	1.44E-16	1.29E-12
6	4.74E-10	6.30E-11	2.94E-12	4.01E-15	1.49E-16	2.58E-13
7	3.32E-10	3.15E-11	8.82E-13	4.14E-16	1.63E-16	5.16E-14
8	2.32E-10	1.575E-11	2.64E-13	1.14E-16	1.22E-16	1.03E-14
9	1.62E-10	7.88E-12	7.93E-14	8.18E-17	1.66E-16	2.09E-15
10	1.13E-10	3.94E-12	2.38E-14	1.44E-16	1.66E-16	5.16E-16

Table 5: Values of the componentwise backward stability error (22) for Algorithm II (BLU), where A is the 16×16 matrix defined in Example 3.

ω/k	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.2
0	7.88E-09	7.88E-09	7.88E-09	7.88E-09	7.88E-09	7.88E-09
1	5.51E-09	3.94E-09	2.36E-09	7.88E-10	4.19E-16	1.57E-09
2	3.86E-09	1.97E-09	7.09E-10	7.88E-11	4.61E-16	3.15E-10
3	2.70E-09	9.85E-10	2.12E-10	7.88E-12	3.07E-16	6.30E-11
4	1.89E-09	4.92E-10	6.38E-11	7.88E-13	3.07E-16	1.26E-11
5	1.32E-09	2.46E-10	1.91E-11	7.89E-14	2.79E-16	2.52E-12
6	9.27E-10	1.23E-10	5.74E-12	7.87E-15	2.27E-16	5.04E-13
7	6.49E-10	6.15E-11	1.72E-12	7.95E-16	3.07E-16	1.01E-13
8	4.54E-10	3.07E-11	5.17E-13	2.25E-16	2.21E-16	2.03E-14
9	3.18E-10	1.53E-11	1.54E-13	1.89E-16	3.04E-16	4.15E-15
10	2.22E-10	7.69E-12	4.65E-14	3.78E-16	3.41E-16	1.02E-15

[3] Å. Björck, Iterative refinement and realiable computing. In Reliable Numerical Computation, M. G. Cox and S. J. Hammarling, editors, Oxford University Press (1990), 249–266.

[4] Å. Björck, Iterative refinement of linear least squares solutions I, BIT 7 (1967), 257–278.

[5] Å. Björck, Iterative refinement of linear least squares solutions II, BIT 8 (1968), 8–30.

[6] J.W.Demmel, N.J.Higham, and R.S.Schreiber, Stability of block LU factorization, Numer. Linear Algebra Appl. 12 (1995), 173–190.

[7] L. V. Foster, Gaussian elimination with partial pivoting can fail in practice, SIAM J.Matrix Anal. Appl. 15 (4) (1994), 1354–1362.

[8] N.J.Higham, Iterative refinement enhances the stability of QR factorization methods for solving linear equations, BIT 31 (1991), 447–468.

[9] N.J.Higham, Iterative refinement for linear systems and LAPACK, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 17(4) (1997), 495–509.

[10] N.J.Higham, *Accuracy and Stability of Numerical Algorithms*, Second Edition, SIAM, Philadelphia (2002).

[11] M.Jankowski, H.Woźniakowski, Iterative refinement implies numerical stability, BIT 17 (1977), 303–311.

[12] C.B.Moler, Iterative refinement in floating point, J.Assoc. Comput. Mach. 14 (2) (1967), 316–321.

[13] M.Rozložník, A.Smoktunowicz and J.Kopal, A note on iterative refinement fo rseminormal equations, Applied Numerical Mathematics 75 (2014), 167–174.

[14] R.D.Skeel, Iterative refinement implies numerical stability for Gaussian elimination, Math. Comp. 35 (1980), 817–832.

[15] Alicja Smoktunowicz and Agata Smoktunowicz, Iterative refinement techniques for solving block linear systems of equations, Applied Numerical Mathematics 67 (2013), 220-229.

[16] J. H. Wilkinson, *The Algebraic Eigenvalue Problem*, Oxford University Press (1965).

[17] X.Wu and Z.Wang, A new iterative refinement with roundoff error analysis, Numer. Linear Algebra Appl. 18 (2011), 275–282.

[18] Z. Zlatev, Use of iterative refinement in the solution of sparse linear systems, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 19(2) (1982), 381-399.